Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command: Mojave	Division: Inland	Number: Chapter 6
Evaluated by: OSSII Vonna Broughton		Date: 12/16/2009
Assisted by: OSSI Sandra Palmer		Date: 12/16/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION □ Division Level Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level □ Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: 12/31/09 Follow-up Inspection ⊠ No Yes For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, Chapter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable Remarks: □ N/A overtime being held responsible for paying a ☐ No minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail? 2. Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated Remarks: □ N/A to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation ⊠ Yes ☐ No notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation? 3. Are reimbursable special project codes being used Remarks: ⊠ Yes □No  $\square$  N/A for all overtime associated with reimbursable special projects? 4. Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel Remarks: X Yes □ N/A □No overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects? 5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable Remarks: □ N/A overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other □ No than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time? 6. Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the Remarks: Not recorded under the ⊠ No □ N/A CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on ☐ Yes "notes" section. a regular day off? 7. Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance -Remarks: □ N/A

Yes

☐ No

Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant

when overtime is associated for civil court?

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8. Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No Peer Support Counselor assigned to Area.
12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Mojave	Division: Inland	Number: 830
Evaluated by: Sgt. Ron Seldor	n	Date: 12/16/2009
Assisted by: Sgt. Royal John	nson	Date: 12/16/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.							
	Lead Inspe	ctor's Signatu	re:				
TYPE OF INSPECTION							
☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level	)						
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	( )	_62	( "	( and			
Follow-up Required:	Commande	er's Signature:	λ 	Date: 12/31/09			
☐ Yes	U	. wii	ma				
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6							
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation				
If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at Area.			
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at Area.			
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
<ol> <li>Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: No concept papers submitted.			
Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

22 49

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at Area
Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Prepared by Division AGPA
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No purchases of grant funded equipment made by Area
Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
<ul> <li>17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?  This would include any of the following: <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No applications for federal funds have been submitted by Area

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at Area
19.	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at Area
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No MCSAP applications have been submitted by Area
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No Homeland Security applications have been submitted by Area
	submitted to the funding agency?				
Questi	submitted to the funding agency? ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23.	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	t Unit	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
23.	Ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Management Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?  Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?		□ No	⊠ N/A	
23.	Ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?  Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	_		Remarks:

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

P	а	a	е	1	of	3

Command	Division:	Chapter:	
Mojave	Inland	6	
Inspected by:		Date:	
Sgt. Ron Seldon, OSSII Vonna Broughton		12/16/2009	

number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This	Inspection docume	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or find number. Under "Forward to:" enter the new not shall be utilized to document innovative proction plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	actices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION  Division Level Command L  Executive Office Level	evel	Total hours expended on the inspection:  2 hours	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:  Yes No  Chapter Inspection:  Inspector's Comments Regar  N/A	Inspect Due D	ate: 1/16/2009	
Command Suggestions for S	tatewi	de Improvement:	

Inspector's Findings:

The Mojave Area is currently using a summary report generated from the CARS program for grant overtime tracking. Grant overtime binders are kept at the Area, however, grant overtime binders should include tabs for each special project code with clear records of overtime worked in the form of a spreadsheet or log.

The above issue was discussed with the Mojave Area Grant Overtime Coordinator Sgt. Johnson. Spreadsheets for Area usage are being constructed.

There is no record found of required quarterly reports being submitted to Inland Division. However, according to the Inland Division AGPA, all quarterly reports have been received from the Mojave Area as required. The overtime coordinator has been advised to begin retaining records of the quarterly report submission at the Area.

All overtime reconciliation reports were found to be signed by the Area Commander or designee.

Random review of 415's reflecting overtime worked on a regular day off did not show "RDO" written in the notes section of the CHP 415. All overtime 415's was properly coded and written explanation for overtime worked was documented on the CHP 415.

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command	Division:	Chapter:
Mojave	Inland	6
Inspected by:		Date:
	OSSII Vonna Broughton	12/16/2009

During a 12 month period, the Monthly Attendance Reports reflected seven months of FLSA hours earned due to scheduling and shift changes to the Alternate workweek.

Commander's Response: Concur or Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

Recommendation have been noted and will BE Discussed AT JAN 5, 2010 STARF MEETING. FLSA OT has been reduced to zero During the last bew months one to a change in the schedule renew process.

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

Required Action

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline

AIG

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

# Mojave Inland Inspected by: Sgt. Ron Seldon, OSSII Vonna Broughton

Division:

Command

Chapter: 6 Date: 12/16/2009

Page 3 of 3

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/31/09
(0000	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE / 12/18/09
☐ Reviewer discussed this report with employee ☐ Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE // CO //O
		/ /